DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 470 234 SP 041 164

AUTHOR	Diez, Mary E.; Blackwell, Peggy J.
TITLE	Collaboration for Teacher Development: Implications for the Design and Implementation of Advanced Master's Programs.
INSTITUTION	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-0-9710353-0-X
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	32p.; Produced as part of the NCATE/NBPTS (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards) Partnership for Graduate Programs.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2010 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20036-1023. Tel: 202-466-7496; Fax: 202-296-6620; e-mail: ncate@ncate.org; Web site: http://www.ncate.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; *Cooperative Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; *Masters Programs; *National Standards; Program Development; *Teacher Collaboration
IDENTIFIERS	National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; *Professionalism

ABSTRACT

This is the fourth of a series of papers exploring the potential influence of National Board for Professional Teaching Standards propositions, standards, and processes on the development of advanced master's programs for teachers. It makes the case that collaboration is at the heart of accomplished teaching, and hence, of critical interest to both the National Board and to advanced master's programs. It begins by reflecting on the use of the word "professional" in the name of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. In arguing that collaboration is integrally connected to professionalism, it explores the definitions and characteristics of collaboration, especially as they relate to education settings. After examining the propositions, standards, and assessments of the National Board to see how collaboration is addressed, the paper returns to the qualities of effective master's programs and examines their implications for collaboration in design and delivery of a program, as well as implications for faculty and student collaboration. The paper concludes with some reflections on the practice of collaboration in this series of papers. (Contains 41 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 470 234

NCATE

NCATE/NBPTS
PARTNERSHIP FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

COLLABORATION FOR TEACHER DEVELOPMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ADVANCED MASTER'S PROGRAMS

Mary E. Diez
Peggy J. Blackwell

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Gubser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

SP 041 164

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Collaboration for Teacher Development:

Implications for the Design and Implementation of Advanced Master's Programs

Mary Diez, Alverno College

Peggy Blackwell, University of New Mexico

NCATE/NBPTS Partnership for Graduate Programs

ISBN 0-9710353-0-X

© The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2002.

Acknowledgements

The editors wish to thank Gary Galluzzo and Stephanie Epp for their continuing support as colleagues and partners in this endeavor.

Preface

New emphasis on student and teacher performance is profoundly influencing the ways that teachers are selected, prepared, licensed, and recognized. Policymakers now expect teachers and teacher candidates to show evidence of knowledge and skill and the ability to apply them to teach effectively.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has accomplished groundbreaking work in the development of standards for effective teaching in specific subject areas, and assessments geared to measure teacher performance against the standards. The National Board's standards contain a vision of accomplished teaching that can become a framework for the redesign of advanced teacher development programs in universities.

NCATE is working in collaboration with the National Board to help institutions modify advanced programs so that they are aligned with NBPTS propositions for accomplished practice. The work was initiated through the former National Partnership for Excellence in Accountability in Teaching (NPEAT) effort, established by the U.S. Department of Education as a collaborative to enhance quality in teaching and teacher preparation. NCATE and the National Board are continuing this work to provide teachers with more specific assistance in enhancing their teaching practice. The new master's degrees geared to National Board standards focus not on preparing teachers to move out of the classroom, but on improving their ability to teach students effectively.

The NCATE/NBPTS partnership encourages schools of education to develop standards-based master's degree programs that are designed to help teachers improve their practice and develop tools to better assess their own effectiveness. Unlike many current master's degree programs that focus on process, the revised master's programs will be geared specifically to improving the art of teaching, which in turn will aid student learning.

The project draws school personnel into partnerships with institutions of higher education, creating new higher education and school faculty roles, new opportunities for research, and new structures

within the school, college, or department of education and the P-12 school.

The project draws school personnel into partnerships with institutions of higher education, creating new higher education and school faculty roles, new opportunities for research, and new structures within the school, college, or department of education and the P-12 school.

Institutions must consider various sets of standards—standards for students, preservice preparation, licensure, and advanced certification—when creating new advanced master's degree programs for teachers. Alignment among these standards is vital to the success of institutions' efforts to improve the quality of teacher education.

"Collaboration for Teacher Development" is the latest in a series of monographs focused on the use of standards and assessments of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in developing and achieving a new vision of master's education for teachers. The paper presents the view of collaboration embedded in the standards of the National Board and presents benchmarks for collaboration in the design and delivery of advanced master's programs.

This series of monographs has been designed to improve teaching practice. The monographs were designed to provide guidance to those engaged in teacher preparation and development, so that a new kind of master's degree comes about—a master's degree that deepens teacher knowledge of content-specific pedagogy with the aim of improving student achievement and student learning.

Boyce C. Williams, Vice President for Institutional Relations, NCATE

Jane Leibbrand, Vice President for Communications, NCATE

Editors

Introduction

This is the fourth of a series of papers exploring the potential influence of National Board for Professional Teaching Standards propositions, standards, and processes on the development of advanced master's programs for teachers, we want to make the case that collaboration is at the heart of accomplished teaching and hence of critical interest to both the National Board and to advanced master's programs. We begin this discussion with some reflection on the use of the word "professional" in the name of the National Board for *Professional* Teaching Standards. In arguing that collaboration is integrally connected to professionalism, we explore the definitions and characteristics of collaboration, especially as they relate to education settings. After examining the propositions, standards, and assessments of the National Board to see how collaboration is addressed, we return to the qualities of effective master's programs and examine their implications for collaboration in design and delivery of a program, as well as implications for faculty and student collaboration. We conclude with some reflections on our own practice of collaboration in this series of papers.

Professionalism and Collaboration

We begin with a discussion of the link between professionalism and collaboration: What does it mean to position teachers and teaching within the notions of "profession" and "professionalism"?

As the scholars who study professionalism as a concept, sociologists have identified specific features of professions, often summarized in three key aspects: specialized training and knowledge in a codified field of knowledge, public recognition of a certain autonomy coupled with responsibility for self-regulation, and commitment to service and altruism beyond one's own economic welfare (Hodson & Sullivan, 1995). Clearly these aspects of "profession" are evident in recent policy and practice regarding teaching and teacher education. One has only to look at the work of the American Association for Teacher Education (AACTE) regarding the knowledge base for beginning teachers in the late 1980s (Reynolds, 1989), the establishment of state professional standards boards in the 1990s, and the emphasis in the National Board standards on community connections to see these emerging hallmarks of a profession.

A historical view is also a useful lens. Sullivan (1995) described the evolution of the professional in his very thoughtful book *Work and Integrity*. Noting the emergence of the notion of profession in eighteenth century Europe, he describes the early iterations of professional

identification as "professions of office," in which the professionals drew their authority from their association with institutions they served—the state, the crown, the church. Because these institutions were respected (or feared), professionals associated with them were treated with respect as well. These institutions also were expected to oversee the common good, so professionals were expected to serve it as well. But they did not necessarily have specialized knowledge or autonomy.

In the nineteenth century, a new and different manifestation emerged—that of the "free or commercial professions," epitomized by the country doctor (think *Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman*), the frontier lawyer, or the circuit-riding preacher on the plains of the U.S. (Sullivan, 1995). In a more open, fluid society, these professionals drew their authority from their professional training. They were the source of healing or other expertise, based on their studies. However, they were often cut off from further contact with sources of information that would expand their base of expertise. Like their counterparts in earlier "professions of office," these free professionals were held in respect by the common people and in turn were expected to help provide for the common good. While they had autonomy, their far-flung operation meant that the notion of self-regulation by the members of a profession could not yet be developed.

The twentieth century saw the rise of organizational professions. According to Sullivan (1995), today's professional has specialized training, provides service to those in need, and is part of a larger group that is self-regulated. In addition, these new professionals draw authority from expertise and effective collaboration through creative functioning in complex organizations. Professionals, he argues, have become mediators between technical knowledge and skill and the larger society. Thus, the context of the "career professional" in complex organizations suggests a fourth feature of a profession: Its members develop special collaborative and integrative skills needed to function as a meaning maker in complex organizations and society, not only making specialized knowledge accessible to the layperson, but translating its benefit in concrete applications. These skills are called forth in connecting and mentoring roles; in today's complex society, professionals interpret and analyze what is going on. Moreover, they have the responsibility for acting on those interpretations and bringing others along.

Schoen (1983) argues professionals have a unique relationship to the broader society. Society perceives professionals as having a "higher purpose." In that sense, professionals come to be arbiters of the social good. Their reflective practice and the mindful application of their skill in social situations expresses values that carry a vision of the individual and

collective good. In fact, some might argue that professionals can not function as professionals where the society around them does not perceive and trust that they are acting this way (Sullivan, 1995).

Another theme emerges in this new, complex vision of the professions: Both professionals and the institutions that they create embody messages to the public. Sizer and Sizer (1999), for example, argue, "The routines and rituals of a school teach, especially about matters of character. We must attend carefully to them, from the seemingly most humble—the way the cafeteria ladies are shown respect, for example, to the most visible—the manner in which issues of essential fairness can be used to learn about the shape of a decent community" (2). How we carry out our work as professionals speaks just as clearly as our words. Sizer and Sizer would agree, we think, that the profession must be conscious of these messages, particularly in our interactions with others, and ensure that they carry the message we intend.

Collaboration, then, is part of the way that professionals carry out their work at the beginning of the twenty-first century. It requires joining together to create new ways of being and working together to make meaning. Very often it manifests itself in the social organization of environments within which people can learn and grow. Our argument here is that, from the late twentieth century, collaboration has become a fourth hallmark of a profession.

Collaboration: Definitions and Common Factors

Collaboration has been defined in a variety of ways in education, most often in ways that describe situations where people/organizations work together to promote change (Rice, 2002). Many definitions focus on sharing authority and responsibility to achieve common goals. For example, Chrislip and Larson (1994) view collaboration as a mutually beneficial relationship that occurs when two or more parties work toward common goals by sharing responsibility, authority, and accountability. Shared decision-making is significant, Marlow and Nass-Fukai (2000, 13) contend, because it is a "pluralistic form of collaboration where people of different backgrounds and job descriptions work together with equal status." Thus, collaboration involves shared decision making, resources, and information. In education, collaboration carries an element of a mutual learning process.

Russell and Flynn (2000) pose three reasons why collaboration is essential. First, it helps to fulfill the institutional mission, whether the institution is school or university. Second, it helps respond to external pressures. Third, collaboration puts in place the practices and programs

that will be of benefit to the future health of the education endeavor. The success of collaboration hinges on the process through which it is implemented. However, it is not the process, per se, that will determine the results, but the fact that the collaborators accept the idea that collaboration will yield greater results and benefits than could be done alone (Green & Etheridge, 1999).

Collaborative efforts in education have become more pervasive during the last 15 years (Magolda, 2001), allowing researchers to begin to study the phenomenon across a range of contexts. Collaboration is often confused with cooperation, togetherness, or coordination (Corrigan, 2001), but the deciding issue is whether the activity results in something the participants could not do alone. Cooperation or togetherness most frequently happens when individuals or organizations of "like minds" come together when they want to work on a common goal, but do so without moving outside their comfort zones and without effecting change (Magolda, 2001). This limitation is seen all too frequently when faculty decide to revise a curriculum. Being of like minds with a common goal, they may cooperate by agreeing on a few modifications that are little more than window dressing, but believe that that they have accomplished major change in the curriculum.

Collaboration, however, goes beyond simple cooperation. According to Williams (1997), "Collaboration is a much used and abused word. Unexamined, it suggests that whatever tasks are to be done can be done equally well by all participants..." (*HBCUTSN Handbook*, 64, as cited in Williams). Research in education, largely case studies, has examined the nature of collaboration, typically in a partnership or professional development school (PDS).

A number of recent reviews and studies propose common features or factors involved in collaboration (Corrigan, 2000; Gitlen 1999, Magolda, 2001; Marlow & Fuss-Fukai, 2000; Kirschenbaum & Reagan, 2001; Rice, 2002; Russell & Flynn, 2000; Walker, 1999; Williams, 1997). We conducted a content analysis of these articles and identified seven common themes or features across these articles.

Motivation for Collaboration

Collaboration is a fragile process, especially in the start-up phases, and attitudes toward collaboration have a major impact on the subsequent success of the effort. Individuals who have positive prior relationships and attitudes that are the result of having been involved in a successful collaborative process before will bring more enthusiasm and confidence

than those who have had negative experiences (Rice, 2002). If the collaborative process is viewed as contrived or coercive, members may resist, especially if they think the outcome has been predetermined. Some members of a collaboration may find it hard to believe that the outcome is not predetermined even when the process is intended to be shared (Blackwell, 2002). The challenges are how to get the participants involved from the start (Corrigan, 2000), how to validate them as equals (Marlow & Nass-Fukai, 2000), and how to lead them to trust the process.

Trust Based on Personal Relations

While many of these factors must be in place simultaneously, we look second at the issue of interpersonal dynamics. Some individuals in a collaboration may not be willing to collaborate; in effect their unwillingness severely limits and may even completely preclude the forward movement of the process. Walker (1999) suggests that the heart of collaboration is building trust based on personal relationships. Good collaboration involves building strong relationships and validating individual members as equals (Marlow & Fuss-Fukai, 2000). However, one consideration is the issue of individuality versus community; for collaboration to succeed, individuals involved must be willing to relinquish some of their autonomy and some balance between the parties must be achieved (Consuella Lewis, Personal Communication, March 25, 2002).

Collegiality might be defined as professional interactions from a position of trust (Marlow & Nass-Fukai, 2000); it certainly plays a role in trust building and in forming new relationships. Marlow & Nass-Fukai identified collegiality and "kuleana" as critical components in collaboration. The Hawaiian term, *kuleana*, implies caring, advocacy, and responsibility, and is the glue that solidifies relationships (Marlow & Nass-Fukai). These goals become both more important and more difficult, considering Gitlen's view of collaboration as a political process. Gitlen (1999) discusses the view that collaboration is intended to realign power relations, particularly as related to "contrived collaboration" that is regulated administratively, compulsory, implementation-oriented, fixed in time and space, and predictable (Hargreaves, 1994 as cited in Gitlen). To overcome such obstacles, building *kuleana* may range from simple actions, such as scheduling meetings at a time convenient for all, to deeper professional activities, such as co-authoring or curriculum change.

Trust Within Cultural Differences

Part of trust building is the ability to identify the norms that guide everyday actions (Magolda, 2001). And so the third factor we address is culture[1] and values of the individuals/organizations involved in collaboration

plays a significant role in the process. Particularly in higher education, where the culture often values harmony and consensus, the status quo typically prevails, and the "collaboration" does not move beyond the individual members' comfort zones (Magolda, 2001). In many groups where organizational cultures are mixed, participants may believe that the collaborative process is coercive, preferring some type of cooperative relationship instead of actual collaboration. In school-university collaboration, cultural differences can work against success, due to lack of time, ideological differences, organizational structures, and policy mandates (Magolda, 2001).

To achieve *kuleana*, participants must understand both their own culture and that of their colleagues (Magolda, 2001). Magolda indicates that a culture provides the comfort zone for individuals that results in basic assumptions about professional practice. We cannot assume that professionals can work in complex settings without examining interpersonal dynamics and the organizational cultures of participants.

Conflict as a Part of Collaboration

Fourth, all collaboration will have some degree of tension and differences, in part because cultural differences are seldom discussed openly, and when participants have to cross boundaries of culture, tensions emerge. In fact, Walker (1999) states that intellectual and emotional conflict is a natural by-product of collaboration, a result that is frequently uncomfortable for those in higher education, who will do everything in their power to make it disappear. Collaboration across the curriculum is an especially difficult discourse for faculty, simply because it means relinquishing some of their autonomy (Lewis, Personal Communication, March 25, 2002). Intellectual tension or conflict provides an opportunity for improvement and innovative solutions to problems, while emotional conflict can be devastating to collaborative efforts (Walker).

Johnson (1999) presents a model for determining when to invest in conflict and when to walk away, based on the importance of goal and relationship elements. If neither the goal nor the relationship is important, parties tend to walk away. If the goal is important, but the relationship is not, one party will use power to coerce the other(s). If the relationship is

---

1 Magolda offers two definitions of culture. The first is from Hays (1994): "A social, durable, layered pattern of cognitive and normative systems that are at once material and ideal, objective and subjective, embodied in artifacts and embedded in behaviors, passes about in interaction, internalized in personalities and externalized in institutions....Culture is a social structure with a logic of its own" (65). Ott (1989) defines culture as "A pattern of shared basic assumptions, invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid, and therefore, is to be taught to new members of the group as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (no page given).

important, but not the goal, then the parties will tend to defer to one another. But if the goal and the relationship are both important, then the parties will confront each other, moving to a depth of interaction to work out the best possible solution. In doing so, they build a stronger relationship as well.

Organizing for Collaboration

Collaboration, whether among individuals or groups, requires some organizational structure. The more complex the partnership, the more need for governance to ensure maintenance of communication, respect, and equity. The fifth factor common in collaboration is formal and informal governance. Formal arrangements, such as a professional development school, warrant formal governance agreements. Less formal collaboration, such as department faculty, also need some governance structure. Even with these arrangements, issues of parity and control often interfere with successful collaboration, according to Rice (2002). Problems occur among faculty as easily as they do in a school-university relationship.

Common Purpose for Collaboration

Sixth, successful collaboration has a shared vision and a common purpose that is understood by participants and is reinforced with strong, frequent, and clear communication. Any collaboration must complement the vision and mission of the program or the organizations that participate (Williams, 1997) and all stakeholders must be involved (Magolda, 2001). Collaborations will be more effective when they are not top-down or coercive, but when participants have a common understanding of the goals, issues and the processes (Williams).

Institutional Commitment for Collaboration

When we are talking about larger collaborations—for example, a K–16 partnership that involves multiple departments of a university and one or more school districts—a seventh factor emerges. Institutional commitment is critical, and key individuals must be involved from the start (Williams, 1997; see also Rice, 2002). The testimony of failed collaborations is instructive—announced with great fanfare, they live on paper only or flourish for a brief time. But an examination of such efforts often reveals the lack of a meaningful organizing structure or the assignment of the effort to a person not central to the life of the institution, who cannot call upon resources and personnel. In those cases, the press of the status quo and the distractions of many other pulls for attention easily undermine the effort. Institutional commitment for collaboration requires that the partner institutions identify

persons in a position to lead the effort, maintain lines of communication, and move the shared vision forward.

Factors for Effective Collaboration

Russell and Flynn (2000) identify five factors that contribute to an effective collaboration. First, the collaboration is sustainable, which implies motivation, progress, and resources. Second, participants view the collaboration positively and, third, it generates positive outcomes in line with the goals and purposes of the collaboration. Fourth, the collaboration creates a way to have open and equal communication and decision-making, and, fifth, it provides an improved means of achieving common purposes more readily. These factors will be more meaningful when the collaborators have mutual respect, a long-term commitment, flexible ways of working together, and a willingness to listen (Russell & Flynn).

Given our focus on links between National Board standards and processes and advanced master's programs for school professionals, we now ask: What can we learn from NBPTS about collaboration and how does it then apply to master's programs?

The View of Collaboration Embedded in NBPTS Standards and Processes

Our approach in the prior three papers has been to examine the work and documents of the National Board and to probe the principles that might be instructive to teacher educators in the design or redesign of advanced master's programs. Here we take our definitions of collaboration and examine the work of the National Board in creating standards, look at the standards themselves to see how collaboration is expected of accomplished teachers, and explore the ways in which National Board assessments address collaboration in action.

The Standards Development Process

The work of the National Board in creating standards models a collaborative approach, bringing together persons representing the subject areas through the "learned societies" and teachers in the field. Standards committees for each of the certificate fields are formed with a majority of teachers who practice at the developmental level and in the content area of the certificate. Other members are also accomplished professionals, who may be experts in child development, teacher education, or the content area. These broadly representative committees of 15 persons develop specific standards for their certificate, supported by National Board staff and a writer who captures the essence of their deliberations.

They submit the standards draft to the Standards Committee of the Board, which then disseminates it for public critique and comment. Only after the results of the public comment phase contribute to revision are the standards approved by the Board.

Using the factors set forth above as common factors of collaboration, the standards committees are especially strong in building trust and sharing the vision of professional certification. They work across organizational cultures, bridging the experience of K-12 teachers, district personnel, and higher education faculty. Tension and disagreements are handled through a strong governance structure, with all members treated equitably and respectfully. Standards committees strongly care about their work and serve as advocates for both the process and the structure.

The Propositions and Standards

The work of the National Board makes explicit the expectation of collaboration in the propositions and in the standards for the certificate areas. Proposition 5, "Teachers are members of learning communities," makes explicit that accomplished teachers collaborate with others for the good of the learners:

> National Board Certified Teachers contribute to the effectiveness of the school by working collaboratively with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development, and staff development. They can evaluate school progress and the allocation of school resources in light of their understanding of state and local educational objectives. They are knowledgeable about specialized school and community resources that can be engaged for their students' benefit and are skilled at employing such resources as needed. Accomplished teachers find ways to work collaboratively and creatively with parents, engaging them productively in the work of the school. (Proposition 5, vii *Exceptional Needs Standards*)

Mirroring the statement of Proposition 5, at least four levels of collaboration are evident in the standards documents, across certificates, even though the organization of these documents varies greatly. The first is collaboration with other professionals, not only to improve instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development, but also to improve educational opportunities for learners and to improve teaching practice *(Middle Childhood through Early Adolescence/Mathematics Standards).* Teachers of exceptional needs students expand the scope of collaboration to include "allied health and medial professionals, ancillary staff, and other

educators to develop realistic and measurable objectives for individual students and to provide services" (*Exceptional Needs Standards*, 12).

The second level is collaboration with parents and families as partners. The *Middle Childhood through Early Adolescence/Mathematics Standards* state, "accomplished mathematics teachers view families as partners who can encourage children to persevere in mathematics" (p. 45). In addition, these standards note the importance of the adults who interact with children outside of school to be informed about mathematics education. They describe activities that teachers undertake to inform and involve adults, e.g. in participating in classrooms, supporting career days, and engaging in mathematics fairs that show the relationship of mathematics to everyday life in the community. In a similar vein, the *Exceptional Needs Standards* describe multiple ways in which "teachers help parents become more knowledgeable about their children's disabilities, strengths, and limitations and about how they can become actively involved in their children's education" (12).

The third level is the work that teachers do to create a collaborative culture in the classroom. The *Middle Childhood through Early Adolescence/ Mathematics Standards* states that the classrooms of accomplished teachers "support the development of students not only as learners of mathematics, but also as social beings within the larger community" (34) through learning activities that support collaborative work. The *Exceptional Needs Standards* outline the importance of students having "the security of belonging to a group and the safety of a congenial setting" (46). In addition, these standards identify a key goal of advancing communication and coping skills for exceptional needs students, assisting them to participate effectively in group settings where collaboration is necessary to complete tasks.

The fourth level is teacher collaboration with the larger community, drawing upon resources, finding support linking learning with community life, and helping the community at large understand instruction in specific subject areas. For example, the *Middle Childhood through Early Adolescence/Mathematics Standards* describe as a responsibility of teachers the need for teachers to

> help students, families and the community at large understand the role of mathematics and mathematics instruction. Consequently, accomplished mathematics teachers reach out beyond the families of their students to the broader community, working to help the community become involved in the mathematics program of the school and the school to remain in touch with the needs, interests, and ideas of the community (p. 46).

Similarly, the *Exceptional Needs Standards* describe the advocacy role of the teacher, which may include participation and leadership in groups formed to influence policy and practice in exceptional education as well as ongoing linking with families, other school personnel, and community leaders.

In both sets of standards, and across all of the standards documents, the new role of the professional as a bridge between expertise and the community is evident. The language of the standards consistently reinforces the notion that teachers help create new ways of being and working together to create meaning—for themselves and their colleagues, for the learners, for parents and caregivers, and for the larger community.

Using the common factors of collaboration, the standards documents capture critical elements of collaboration, both between individual teachers and among teachers and a range of stakeholders. The standards have a clear expectation regarding the motivation of accomplished teachers to take the initiative to collaborate with the students, students' families and communities, and a range of professional partners. The standards outline the ways in which teachers build trust, respect differences in culture, and serve as advocates for learning.

The Assessments

In expecting the design of assessments as part of a required portfolio, the work of the National Board reinforces expectations set forth in the standards for collaboration. Perhaps the greatest focus on collaboration is embedded in the teacher's classroom practice, in entries in which teachers are asked to describe, analyze, and reflect on their practice. The use of videotapes provides a picture of teachers' interaction with their students and the climate they create in the classroom. In the Middle Childhood Generalist portfolio, for example, teachers are asked to prepare an entry that illustrates how they encourage student interaction, i.e., in the solution of a problem or the development of a project.

In every certificate's portfolio, there is an entry called "documented accomplishments," which documents the teacher's work outside the classroom with families and the larger community, as well as with colleagues and the larger profession. The directions for this entry, taken from the *Early Adolescence and Young Adult World Languages Other than English*, make it very clear that the National Board assessment process values collaboration:

> In this entry you will demonstrate your commitment to students' language learning through your work with students' families and community and through your development as a learner and a

leader/collaborator. You can demonstrate your commitment through evidence of your efforts to establish and maintain partnerships with students' families and the community, through evidence or your growth as a learner and through work that you do with other teachers at a local, state, or national level.

In completing the entry, candidates for National Board Certification submit communication logs, documenting their interaction with parents and guardians of their students. They describe and analyze their work with other teachers and with community groups, making a clear link back to the impact of that work on student learning. Thus, the "Documented Accomplishments" entry emphasizes how the "professional" work of the teacher must be collaborative, including the ways in which the teacher operates in the four levels of collaboration found in the standards, as discussed above.

The common factors are evident in the assessment process. Describing and analyzing the building of trust with parents and guardians of students exemplifies the necessity and the success of understanding cultures other than one's own. As they address both connections with parents and work with other teachers, teachers preparing the entry make explicit not only their understanding of a shared vision and common purpose, but also their motivation for acting in a professional manner.

Application to Master's Programs

Implications for Design and Delivery

Next, we look specifically at the collaboration in the design and delivery of master's programs. The standards development process, as well as the standards and assessments of the National Board, suggest benchmarks that can be useful to those developing and implementing advanced master's programs. We identify benchmarks and suggest how attending to them might strengthen master's programs.

1. *The design of National Board standards and processes is a collaborative process. Stakeholders in the effort include all those whose input is critical—not only practicing teachers, who are the focus of the work, but curriculum specialists in K–12 schools, college and university faculty, and leaders of professional associations.*

A key message for the designers of advanced master's programs is that a similar group of stakeholders ought to be assembled when these programs are being designed and when they are being reviewed, as they should be at least as often as the National Board standards are reviewed—

i.e., a minimum of every 10 years. And, as is the case with the National Board, the inclusion of stakeholders should be meaningful; bringing in teachers and district personnel to put the stamp of approval on a *fait accompli* is not the kind of collaboration that the benchmark suggests.

In Blackwell and Diez (1999), we describe how the UNC-Chapel Hill planning committee, comprised of faculty from the school of education, teachers, administrators, and superintendents, worked to find common planning time. Like many other institutions, North Carolina-Greensboro has engaged a group of National Board Certified Teachers in the design of a new master's program (Blackwell & Diez, 1999).

2. *The standards of the National Board make clear four specific ways in which accomplished teachers work collaboratively—with other professionals, parents and families, the larger community and within the classroom.*

A key message for the designers of advanced master's programs is that the conceptualization of the master's program should attend to these levels of collaboration in outlining the candidate proficiencies required by NCATE's criteria for the program's conceptual framework. Whether a planning team is looking at a new design or a redesign of the master's program, they need to examine the proficiencies for evidence of collaboration. What theoretical frameworks are introduced that lay the groundwork for creating a collaborative classroom? What opportunities to practice working with other professionals on meaningful projects is provided—both within class groups and in assignments that take the candidate into school sites? What theoretical frameworks are introduced to guide the development of meaningful parental interaction? What practice is provided in interacting with parents, particularly of different ethnic and/or class backgrounds than the candidate's own? What opportunities to develop knowledge and skill are provided to help individuals make connections to the larger community?

Once the proficiencies are clear, designers need to identify relevant literature to support the knowledge base for practice. Equally important in program and course design is the incorporation of a range of practice opportunities, from case studies, to simulations in class, to actual interactions in school settings. Clearly it is not enough to talk about collaboration. Therefore, the design should also attend to developing informal and formal structures in the program and courses that will support a collaborative atmosphere for learning.

3. *The assessments of the National Board emphasize collaboration in asking teachers to describe and analyze the ways in which they work collaboratively*

with their students, with students' families, with other professionals, and with the larger community.

A key message for the designers of advanced master's programs is that collaboration can and should be assessed. NCATE standards, too, call for the assessment process to address the proficiencies identified in advanced master's programs. We suggest, however, that advanced master's programs can go farther than the assessments of the National Board, which are limited by the format of the school site portfolio. The National Board's use of description and analysis is a good example of a reflection that can be used for assessment, but given the format of master's programs, many more possibilities could be employed.

Blackwell and Diez (1999), while reporting that many programs were in the initial stages of assessment design, provided an example of an assessment at Alverno College, in which master's students collaboratively develop a conference at which to share the results of their action research projects. An assessment criterion for the conference project is the development of ways to engage the audience (both family members and professional colleagues) in interaction.

In another assessment from Alverno's master's program, described in Diez and Blackwell (2001), master's students are videotaped providing feedback to each other on the development of research questions. The assessment looks at their performance in clarifying issues and making supportive suggestions for refining the question and linking it to appropriate theoretical frameworks.

The range of assessments to be developed should match the range of proficiencies outlined in the conceptual framework for the program. And, just as the National Board sought support for developing its assessment expertise, master's program designers may need to draw upon resources and take opportunities to learn how to guide their students in developing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to collaboration.

Implications for Faculty/Student Collaboration

University faculties are actually more isolated than their colleagues in K–12 schools when it relates to teaching and classrooms. Faculty greatly value academic freedom, which translates into almost complete autonomy. What collaboration there is typically does not ask faculty to move beyond their comfort zones and consequently is little more than superficial. Such emphasis on autonomy is an enduring pattern of higher education and inhibits collaboration (Sandholtz, 2000). However, Fullan (1991) maintains that significant education change will occur only if there is a change in beliefs

and teaching styles, and we infer, in collaborative processes. In fact, teaming and collaboration have become a mantra in business over the past twenty years (Eisen, 2000), to such an extent that educators must pay heed. In business, teams have been used to reduce hierarchy, improve quality, and foster creativity (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 2000 as cited in Eisen). Team teaching and student cohorts are two approaches that have emerged in recent years in graduate programs that have the promise to achieve these goals.

Davis (1995) defined team teaching as "arrangements that include two or more faculty in some level of collaboration in the planning and delivery of a course" (p. 8 as cited in Eisen, 2000). Commonly, one can distinguish four types of team teaching. First, "turn teaching" or parallel teaching as it is sometimes called, is individually planned and delivered, with the other member(s) of the team in the classroom. Second, team planning may be coupled with turn teaching, where the team members work together to plan the instruction and curriculum but then individually design the actual delivery. In this instance, joint curriculum planning may be limited to simple decisions about major topics, with the actual details and content left to the individual. Third, team planning and evaluation may be coupled with joint teaching where one individual serves as the "lead" teacher and the other member(s) join in discussions or ask questions from time to time. Fourth, true team teaching involves collaborative planning, instruction, and evaluation, and all members of the team are equals. Team teaching in this instance differs from the previous three types in that they result in little more than deciding what tasks to assign to whom, while instructional teaming results in shared decisions and instruction.

A recent study of administrative teams (Dee, Dole, Phair, & Shay, 2002) found that team work produced greater synergy, critical thinking, and ownership of the issue than when individuals worked alone. Challenges for higher education teams included frequent changes in committee or team membership (fluid participation), high level of turnover in administrative ranks, and institution rewards for individual accomplishments, rather than collective action. In this study, trust was the foundation of effective teams and the quality of the team was mediated by the willingness of individual participants to trust others. Trust formed in this way led to social "risk taking," an essential feature of innovative solutions. If team members instead adopted functional area roles, trust was difficult to establish, and the focus on functional areas resulted in resource conflict and turf battles. If the focus of the team members was on how decisions were made, the result tended to be more self-interest with marginal outcomes.

According to Sandholtz (2000), true team teaching, when coupled with curriculum revision, frequently leads to innovation in teaching strategies and professional growth of the team members. Sharing power of decision making with team members also paves the way for sharing control with learners (Eisen, 2000), with the end result that both teachers and learners learn from one another. Eisen strongly maintains that higher education faculty cannot advocate collaboration with practicing it. The sense of sharing, knowing, and supporting becomes a powerful motivator in enhancing and maintaining faculty and student collaboration.

The second approach to collaboration, student cohorts, exists when a group of students engage in a program of study together (Yerkes, Norris, Basom, & Barnett, 1994). Slater (2000) uses four criteria for identifying a cohort. It is a self-managed group that is intact, identifiable, and that has authority and responsibility to decide on how a task is to be done when charged to generate an identifiable product. Three models of cohorts were suggested by Basom (1993). Perhaps the most common is when an intact group of students completes all coursework together, referred to as a closed cohort. When students take some coursework outside cohort-based courses, the cohort is referred to as open. A fluid cohort occurs when students move in and out.

Several advantages of cohorts have been suggested (Potthoff, Batenhorst, & Fredrickson, 2001). The first is the development of a collaborative culture, which itself is a force for change. Second, personal relationships are fostered through decision-making processes and professional connections, and third, retention is often improved. Students' abilities to develop multiple perspectives, do scholarly work, and improve their performance combine to create a fourth advantage. The fifth advantage is the positive impact on faculty, who explore new instruction and assessment practices as they collaborate[2].

As Potthoff, et al. indicate, the cohort is a highly complex entity. They cite the work of Huey (1996) in exploring eight dimensions common to cohorts: (1) Social interaction and interdependence reveal whether or not there is a cohesive and shared climate for learning; (2) Commonality of purpose is a shared promise among cohort members; (3) Group and individual learning reflects the balance between individual learning and that of the group. This implies that both individual and group goals should be achieved; (4) Cohesion exists when there are structured cooperative experiences, fun activities, and commitment to group goals as

2 Potthoff, et al. cite the following: Barnett & Muse, 1993 (#2)); Basom 1993 (#5); Fullan, 2001 (#1); Hill, 1992 (#3 & 4); Wehlage, Rutter, et al. 1988 (#3); Yerkes, Norris, et al. 1993 (#3).

well as acceptance of differing opinions; (5) Individual learning and group interaction must be fostered during early cohort stages and warrants a cohort facilitator who helps the group understand factors that contribute to effective group processes; (6) Individual achievement reflects academic performance and may increase expectations and motivation. Collaborative learning strategies are an essential element of this dimension; (7) Interaction with faculty is influenced in large part by individual faculty's teaching strategies. Teaching in a cohort, perhaps with a cohort of faculty, often results in rethinking traditional classroom techniques; and (8) Student retention is often improved in part because the cohort overcomes student isolation.

Walker (1999) proposes that collaboration through teams and cohorts increases accountability in higher education, while Green and Etheridge (1999) believe that course and teaching collaboration are an essential element of improving student learning. Nonetheless, there are real barriers. The practice of working independently and the absence of collegiality in higher education, coupled with a reward system that works against collaboration, pose formidable obstacles for faculty to overcome (Williams, 1997). Some faculty may be hesitant to collaborate, especially with regard to curriculum revision or team teaching because they think it threatens existing norms of practice and power or think that it is an indictment of current practice (Walker, 1999). Structural hurdles also exist. Registrar's offices often have difficulty comprehending the notion of team teaching or student cohorts, while provosts and deans ask questions about teaching load, salary allocations, and student credit hour production (Slater & Trowbridge, 2000).

Our Collaborative Experiences

Graduate Students Within a Program

The Master of Arts in Education program at Alverno College consciously builds a collaborative ethic among students and faculty. The focus on collaboration is explicit in the outcomes of the program and an experience in the orientation weekend helps set the stage for the development of expectations that carry through the program. In preparation for the orientation weekend, beginning students read a section from *The Tao of Conversation* (Kahn, 1995). At the session, they discuss Kahn's vivid metaphors (e.g. contrasting playing "king of the hill" with engaging in a "barn raising") and identify past experiences of working and interacting with others—both positive and negative. They collaboratively develop a beginning set of criteria for interaction to use to guide their work. Typically, the groups develop criteria that bear a strong resemblance to Russell and Flynn's characteristics of collaboration, e.g., listening thoughtfully to others,

building upon others' ideas, using critique to improve and grow, and fostering a climate of mutual support.

In subsequent courses, Alverno faculty reinforce the principles of effective social interaction as a key to collaborative group work, not only among students, but in students' application of what they are learning in settings where they work with colleagues, community members, and their own K–12 students. Explicit criteria, building on those the students have developed, are applied in the assessment of group tasks. Formal assessments, like those described in Blackwell and Diez (1999) and Diez and Blackwell (2001), are also incorporated at key points in the curriculum.

In addition, Alverno faculty consciously model the ongoing collaborative work they expect of the MA students. Each semester, a series of meetings is held, bringing together full and part time faculty in particular program areas to address pressing issues and to review how well the courses are meeting students' needs. These discussions feed into the ongoing development of the program. At a meeting in spring 2002, for example, faculty proposed the development of an action research handbook to assist students in integrating experiences across courses as they move toward their culminating major action research project. A subgroup of faculty agreed to develop a draft and bring it back to the full group for discussion and approval.

Faculty Collaboration

The faculty in educational administration at the University of New Mexico originally developed an Ed.D. program as an alternative to the traditional Ph.D. program in 1995. Designed as an evening/weekend program with biannual admissions, faculty turnover heightened the need to revisit the curriculum and some processes in the late 1990s. However, as discussions evolved, tensions and disagreements among the faculty grew to the point where the survival of the program was in some doubt. The faculty meetings in some respects modeled Osmo Wiio's laws of communication (1978, as cited in Goldhaber, 1993):

- Law One: Communication usually fails--except by chance;
- Law Two: If a message can be understood in different ways, it will be understood in just the way which does the most harm;
- Law Three: There is always somebody who knows better than you what you meant by your message;

- Law Four: The more communication there is, the more difficult it is for communication to succeed.

It seemed in many faculty meetings that faculty were treading the same ground with the same negative outcomes to the point that they backed away from the issue for a period of time to let emotions cool. Then, with the arrival of a new department chair, discussions began again but in a more deliberate and structured manner.

New national standards in educational administration and NCATE created an opportunity to discuss and modify the program's mission and vision. Various sets of standards were aligned and then used as benchmarks for curriculum discussions, which shifted the center of attention from personal interests and the final product to a more collaborative discussion about what standards really meant, how they might be achieved, and how faculty would know students learned. Faculty became more attentive to language, both theirs and those of the standards. As these discussions progressed, it was obvious that the conversations had become more collegial and respectful. Communication increased, more in line with Johnson's model (1999) than with Wiio's Fourth Law. Faculty have moved to a depth of collaboration that has permitted them to work out best possible solutions, by taking the risk of moving out of individual comfort zones and crossing the borders of one another's culture and values. The key question has become place in the program instead of who will teach what. Just as with students in the Alverno master's program, the process bears a strong resemblance to Russell and Flynn's characteristics of collaboration. Careful listening enables building upon ideas and fosters a climate of mutual support.

We conclude with a short reflection on our collaboration on the four papers in this series, partly to celebrate that experience and partly to probe it for the learning we might find there. When Boyce Williams of NCATE asked us to work together, we did not know each other well and had spent our academic careers at very different types of institutions—Mary at a small liberal arts college and Peggy at a large research university. Using the synthesis of elements of collaboration from this paper, we were both motivated to come into the partnership, believing that much could be learned from looking at the standards and processes of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in relationship to advanced master's programs for teachers.

As anyone who has ever co-authored a work knows, we learned that trust was important to establish, especially when tensions or conflicts arose in what to cut when the page limit was exceeded or how to phrase a

conclusion. We entered the process as equals and have seen our respective strengths combine in ways we had not predicted. While we didn't know the word for the first three papers, it was really *kuleana* (caring, advocacy, and responsibility) that we were developing.

References

Barnett, B. G. & Muse, I. D. (1993) Cohort groups in educational administration: Promises and challenges. *Journal of School Leadership, 3,* 400-415.

Basom, M. (1993). Educational leadership faculty involved in teacher education. *Connections! Conversations on issues of principal preparation, 2* (1), 3.

Blackwell, P. J. (2002). Fitting the pieces together: Lessons learned by the Eisenhower Initial Teacher Professional Development Programs. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, (New Orleans, April 3).

Chrislip, D. & Larson, C. (1994). *Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Corrigan, D. (2000). The changing role of schools and higher education institutions with respect to community-based interagency collaboration and interprofessional partnerships. *Peabody Journal of Education, 75* (3), 176-195.

Davis, J. R. (1995). *Interdisciplinary courses and team teaching: New arrangements for learning.* Phoenix: ACE/Oryx.

Dee, J. R., Dole, S., Phair, C., & Shay, P. (2002). Trust and collaboration in zero-history administrative teams. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, April 2).

Eisen, M. J. (2000). The many faces of team teaching and learning: An overview. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 87* (Fall), 5-14. Available from First Search. Accessed 1/30/02.

Fullan, M. (1991) *The means of education change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. G. (2001). Teacher educator as advocate. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (New Orleans, Feb. 18).

Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., and Donnelly, J. H. (2000) *Organizations: Behavior, structure, processes.* (10th ed.). Chicago: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

Gitlen, A. (1999). Collaboration and progressive school reform. *Educational Policy, 13* (5), 630-658. Available from FirstSearch. Accessed 1/30/02.

Goldhaber, G. M. (1993). *Organizational Communication.* (6th ed.) Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Green, R. L. & Etheridge, C. P. (1999). Building collaborative relationships between schools and the university for instructional improvement. *Education, 120* (2), 388-396. Available from FirstSearch. Accessed 3/20/02.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers work and culture in a postmodern age.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hays, S. (1994). Structure and agency and the sticky problem with culture. *Sociological Theory, 12* (1), 57-72.

Hill, M. S. (1992). Graduate cohorts: Perceptions of benefits and catalysts to cohesiveness or 19 heads are better than one. Unpublished manuscript.

Hodson, R. & Sullivan, T.A. (1995). *The social organization of work,* 2nd edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Huey, G. L. (1996). The impact of cohort group membership on preservice teachers. Unpublished master's thesis, Iowa State University, Ames.

Johnson, D.W. (1999). *Reaching out: Interpersonal effectiveness and self-actualization,* 7th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Kahn, M. (1995). *The Tao of Conversation.* Oakland, CA: New Harbinger Press.

Kirschembaum, H. & Reagan, C. (2001). University and urban school partnerships. Urban Education, 36 (4), 479-504. Available from FirstSearch. Accessed 3/16/02.

Magolda, P. (2001). Border crossings: Collaboration struggles in education. *The Journal of Educational Researh, 94* (6), 346-358. Available from FirstSearch. Accessed 3/16/02.

Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel Sunday August 22, 1999. Theodore Sizer and Nancy Faust Sizer. Back to School Balancing Act

Marlow, M. P. & Nass-Fukai, J. (2000). Collegiality, collaboration, and kuleana: Three crucial components for sustaining effective school-university partnerships. *Education, 121* (1), 188-194, 72. Available from FirstSearch, accessed 2/16/02.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1998). *Middle Childhood through Early Adolescence/Mathematics Standards.* Southfield, MI: Author.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1999). *Exceptional Needs Standards.* Southfield, MI: Author.

Ott, J. S. (1981). *The organizational culture perspective.* Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Potthoff, D. E., Batenhorst, E. V., & Fredrickson, S. A. (2001). Learning about cohorts—a masters degree program for teachers. *Action in Teacher Education, 23* (2), 36-42. Available from FirstSearch. Accessed 1/30/02.

Reynolds, M.C. (Ed.) (1989). *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Rice, E. H. (2002). The collaboration process in professional development schools: Results of a meta-ethnography, 1990-1998. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53* (1), 55-67.

Russell, J. F. & Flynn, R. B. (2000). Commonalities across effective collaboratives. *Peabody Journal of Education, 75* (3), 196-204. Available from FirstSearch. Accessed 1/30/02.

Sandholtz, J. H. (2000). Interdisciplinary team teaching as a form of professional development. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 27* (3), 39-54. Available from FirstSearch. Accessed 3/16/02.

Schon, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Slater, C. L. and Trowbride, S. (2000). Master's level cohorts combat teacher isolation: University/school district collaboration. *Action in Teacher Education, 22* (1), 15-22. Available from FirstSearch. Accessed 3/16/02.

Sullivan, W. M. (1995). *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America.* New York: HarperCollins.

Walker, W. (1999). Collaboration: "The faint of heart need not apply." *Peabody Journal of Education, 74* (3-4), 300-305.

Wehlage, G., Rutter, R., Smith, G., Lesko, N., & Fernandez, R. (1988). Reducing the risk: Schools as communities of support. New York: Falmer Press.

Wiio, O. (1978). *Wiio's laws—and some others.* Espoo Finland: Welin-GÖÖs.

Williams, B. C. (1997). Challenges and opportunities for collaboration in teacher education programs. *Action in Teacher Education, XIX* (2), 89-96.

Yerkes, D., Norris, C., Basom, M., & Barnett, B. (1994). Exploring cohorts: Effects on principal preparation and leadership practice. *Connections!, 2* (3), 1, 5-8.

NCATE

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
2010 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036-1023
(202) 466-7496
fax: (202) 296-6620
e-mail: ncate@ncate.org
website: http://www.ncate.org

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").